

Remarks

In the Office Action mailed May 23, 2006 (“the Office Action”), the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (“the Patent Office”) acknowledged that claims 1-20 are pending in the application. The Patent Office also acknowledged that claim 20 is allowed. Additionally, the Patent Office stated that the drawings filed February 5, 2004, are accepted by the Examiner. Lastly, the Patent Office stated that claims 6, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 19 are objected to

In the Office Action, the Patent Office rejected claims 1-5, 7-12, 14, and 17. Furthermore, the Patent Office objected to the specification as well as claims 6, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 19. The Patent Office stated that claims 6, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The applicant traverses the rejections and objections for the reasons that follow.

Objection to the Specification:

In the Office Action, the Patent Office objected to the Abstract as filed for the reasons stated in the Office Action. While not acceding to the allegations of the Patent Office and merely to expedite prosecution of the present application, the Abstract has been amended herein.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

Objection to Claims 3 and 11:

In the Office Action, the Patent Office objected to claims 3 and 11 for the reasons stated in the Office Action. While not acceding to the allegations of the Patent Office and merely to expedite prosecution of the present application, the claims have been amended herein.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 3 and 11.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-12, 14, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

In the Office Action, the Patent Office rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-12, 14, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,520,169 (Georgieff *et al.*) for reasons stated in the Office Action. While not acceding to the allegations of the Patent Office and merely to expedite prosecution of the present application, the claims have been amended herein.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-12, 14, and 17.

Rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

In the Office Action, the Patent Office rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,520,169 (Georgieff *et al.*). While not acceding to the allegations of the Patent Office and merely to expedite prosecution of the present application, the claims have been amended herein.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7 and 11.

Rejection of claims 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

In the Office Action, the Patent Office rejected claims 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,520,169 (Georgieff *et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,676,133 (Hickle *et al.*) for the reasons stated in the Office Action. While not acceding to the allegations of the Patent Office and merely to expedite prosecution of the present application, the claims have been amended herein.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4 and 8.

Conclusion

The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the amendments and remarks herein. The amendments are made merely to expedite prosecution of the present patent application and are made without disclaimer of any subject matter, without prejudice to future prosecution, and without presumption that the actions are taken for any reason related to patentability. The Patent Office is invited to contact the undersigned at 312 913 2117 or chael@mbhb.com, should the Patent Office believe such contact would expedite prosecution of the present application. The applicant respectfully contends that the pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability.

Respectfully,

/Mark L. Chael/

Date: November 24, 2006

Mark L. Chael, J.D., Ph.D.
Reg. No. 44,601

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
312 913 0001, phone
312 913 0002, fax